

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

By way of the above amendments, claims 44, 46, 48, 51-54, 57, 59 and 62-64 have been amended and remain in the application. Claims 45, 47, 49, 50, 55, 56, 58, 60, 61 and 65-69 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The examiner rejected claims 65-69 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Jalili* (U.S. Patent No. 6,209,104). As noted above, claims 65-69 have been cancelled herein, rendering the rejection moot.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The examiner rejected claims 44-64 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jalili* in view of *Martino* (U.S. Patent No. 5,276,314). The applicant traverses these rejections.

With respect to independent claim 44, the examiner stated that “[a]lthough *Jaili* discloses detecting selection of multiple points in a graphical image including a number of elements displayed at the client, each of the multiple points associated with a portion of the security code, the number of elements in *Jalili* is not positioned in a different configuration after each selection of each of the multiple points.” However, the examiner pointed to *Martino* as disclosing “a system wherein the number of elements [is] repositioned in a different configuration after each selection of each portion of the security code.” The examiner therefore concluded that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of *Martino* and *Jalili*. The examiner’s rejection of independent claim 54 was based upon similar rationale.

As further clarified by way of the above amendments, independent claims 44 and 54 recite methods for securely transmitting a code between a client and a server. The server generates a keypad entry image including a plurality key elements in a pseudo-random arrangement and transmits the keypad entry image to the client device for display to a user. After displaying the keypad entry image, the client device detects selection by the user of one

of the key elements associated with a portion of the code and determines at least one coordinate representing the location of the selected key element within the keypad entry image. The client then transmits the at least one coordinate of the selected key element to the server.

In response to receiving the at least one coordinate of the selected keypad element, the server processes that at least one coordinate to determine the portion of the security code associated with the selected key element. If it is determined that the selected key element is not associated with a completion code, the server generates another keypad entry image including the plurality key elements in a different pseudo-random arrangement and transmits the same to the client device for display to the user. The server subsequently receives from the client device at least one coordinate of another selected key element and processes that at least one coordinate to determine another portion of the security code. When it has been determined that a selected key element is associated with the completion code, the server constructs the code by combining each of the determined portions of the code and then the server validates the code.

As the applicant understands, *Martino* discloses a system in which an array of symbols is presented to the user and the user is required to manipulate several symbols at once until assigned key symbols are manipulated into predetermined states. See, generally, *Martino* at *Abstract*. In contrast to the inventions recited in independent claims 44 and 54 of the present application, *Martino* teaches that a displayed array of symbols is manipulated in a defined and predictable manner, in accordance with user input. See *Martino* col. 5, line 55 – col. 6, line 10. In other words the user controls the manipulation of the symbol array in order to achieve a desired arrangement of the symbols. Thus, *Martino* teaches away from the concept of displaying a new keyboard entry image having pseudo-randomly arranged key elements following user selection of each key element associated with a portion of a code. If the symbol array in *Martino* were to be rearranged pseudo-randomly in response to each user input command, the user would never be able to achieve his/her desired arrangement of the symbols.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that the combination of *Jalili* and *Martino* does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every step of the methods recited in independent claims 44 and 54, as amended. In particular, with respect to amended independent claim 44, the combination of *Jalili* and *Martino* fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least the step

of: “...until it is determined that said selected key element is associated with a completion code, repeating [the] steps [of] ... receiving from a server a keypad entry image including a plurality key elements in a pseudo-random arrangement and displaying said keypad entry image to a user...” With respect to amended independent claim 54, the combination of *Jalili* and *Martino* fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least the step of: “...until it is determined that said selected key element is associated with a completion code, repeating [the] steps [of] ... generating a keypad entry image including a plurality key elements in a pseudo-random arrangement and transmitting said keypad entry image to a client device for display to a user...” The applicant therefore submits that the inventions of independent claims 44 and 54 are patentable over *Jalili* and *Martino*.

Dependent claims 46, 48, 51-53, 57, 59 and 62-64 are therefore patentable for at least the reasons noted with regard to independent claims 44 and 54, and may be patentable for additional reasons. The above amendments to the dependent claims were made only for the sake of clarity and/or consistency. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of pending claims 44, 46, 48, 51-54, 57, 59 and 62-64.

Conclusion

The foregoing is believed fully responsive to the Office Action dated October 22, 2007. A request for a 2-month extension of time for filing this response, together with the fee required by 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a)(3), is enclosed. The time for filing this response is thereby extended to today, Monday, March 24, 2008 (given that March 22, 2008 fell on a Saturday), and this response is timely filed. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees and credit any refund to Deposit Account No. 11-0855.

Respectfully submitted:

/Michael Pavento/

Michael S. Pavento
Reg. No. 42,985

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street
Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
Tel. (404) 815-6213
Fax (404) 541-4676